



ACHIM SZEPAŃSKI 2024-08-23

## FORAMINIFEDERALOGIE CONTRA NON-TOLOGY. (DISCUSSION BETWEEN ANNA NEWSPEAK UND ACHIM SZEPAŃSKI)

ECONOFICTION CAPITAL, COMMUNSIMS, DERRIDA, FORCED WORK, LARUELLE, MARXISM, NONTOLOGY

Discussion between Anna Newspeak and Achim Szepanski

**Anna Newspeak:** Perhaps it is precisely nontological not to write, since non-writing is closest to the movement of nothingness. It remains to be remembered that although Derrida did a great job of pursuing the difference between voice and writing to the detriment of writing, today it is nevertheless the case that neoliberalism forces us to write. You have to write to survive, otherwise the market will kill you; otherwise you will be told that you have committed

the crime of not writing. You must write. You should write. Even if there is nothing new: WRITE! Perhaps another difference needs to be analyzed against Derrida today – that between writing and reading. Writing is superior to reading. Whoever writes still works at least a little (even if it is despised work), but whoever reads is the ultimate crime of non-work. In reading, nothingness “works” even more than in writing. Reading is the greatest threat to the hegemonic world equivalence chain. That is why there is a structural injunction to write. Writing today is forced labor (in the still metaphysical elaboration of this phantomality). WRITE!

**Achim Szepanski:** But even reading has long been work, hasn't it?

**Anna Newspeak:** Well, that's the question. Work or rather forced labor. Speaking of “forced labor”:

One of the most extreme results of negative deconstruction is that it has to take the side of forced labor. Forced labor for everyone? Isn't that left-wing totalitarianism? Well, no. Let's remember: don't all totalitarianisms – whether fascism, capitalism, socialism or theologism – take the side of labor? “He who does not work shall not eat.” Accordingly, forced labor is used against “the unemployed”, sometimes in weaker, often in harsher intensities. But a negative deconstruction of the difference between work/forced labor is confronted with operating from forced labor. That has never happened. Not even Derrida went that far, who in turn only got as far as mourning labor. But forced labor is even more negative than mourning labor. So the question is: negative deconstruction = labor camps for all? No. Forced labor must be understood in the sense of a negative *différance*, which has always been forced labor. Forced labor has always taken place, long before the labor camp, long before the social construction of unemployment, because there is no unemployment, no inactivity, which means – and everyone will find this infinitely difficult to understand – that doing nothing, not working, inactivity is already forced labor. Doing nothing, non-work, inactivity – these are not immovable things, but rather doing nothing, non-work and inactivity are the movement of forced labor before all work and even before all mourning work in Derrida's sense. Forced labor establishes *pesipalism* – a negative capitalism of inferior value, of *contrafit*, of *abitrage*, of *nerivative*, etc.; “*pesipalism*” will therefore be the negative *gramma* that crosses all four totalitarianisms. *Pesipalism* (from the Latin *pes*, foot) is not a pure *negativum*, but the movement of the negativity of all negativity, in which the positive occurs only derivatively. If Derrida was still a *phantomologist*, I will now have been a *pesipalist*. *Pesipalism* can therefore also be understood as a negative(er) *phantomology* of the *spectre*, which no longer feeds on the still positive *logocentric* legacy (call, shout, invocation, profession, call of enjoyment, etc.) of capitalism, but already *neoconstructs*, *nontologizes*, denies it in all its moments. ... Will the left, which has always been the structural type of forced labor (hence all the exhaustion, the endless spread of depression, sadness, suicidal tendencies) go along with this new forced labor?

**Achim Szepanski:** Günther Anders on this: “Truly, one can become fearful and anxious when one realizes that even now, at this moment, hundreds of millions are engaged in such gymnastics, and that these hundreds of millions are even grateful for the fact that they, in contrast to millions of less fortunate people: the unemployed, are still allowed to do these gymnastics; and that they doggedly proclaim, indeed must proclaim, the right to these gymnastics as a fundamental political right, because without such vain gymnastics they

would stand in the void, or – but this ‘doing’ is only a disguise for doing nothing – would sit in front of the screen; and because they would be forced to eat their way through the mush of time piling up before them again and again every day. ”

**Anna Newspeak:** That’s just the problem: forced labor has always been understood absence-metaphysically as pure nothingness (that’s why Laruelle comes back to One, as I said, even with everything non-) However, it is important to distinguish the absence-metaphysical forced labor of totalitarianism from non-absence-metaphysical, i.e. neoconstructive forced labor. The latter will also have been the difference between left-wing and right-wing forced labor.

**Achim Szepanski:** Forced labor is the complement to free wage labor. Every variant, left or right, will remain entangled in this dialectic. Or let’s say difference. You have to determine the place of différance, it is a form of movement of capital. The thinking of the One is a radical break with such thinking and forms of movement. Transcendentally set, there is no other way.

**Anna Newspeak:** As I said, my criticism of this strategy is that it is absence metaphysics – pure non, which Laruelle calls “One” or “transcendental”. That’s exactly why I have the BGB and the Laruelleans don’t. It is pure negativity that is propagated there. Neconstruction, on the other hand, knows no pure negativity, but only becomes more negative, more empty, more nontological.

**Achim Szepanski:** On the one hand, the real is transcendental, a negative condition. On the other hand, given-without-given. Laruelle remains a materialist without becoming ontological. ... Emptier than empty? Even the Buddhist David Loy raised justified, materialist objections to Derrida.

**Anna Newspeak:** That’s just too materialistic for me. I would advocate an immaterialism that would be extremely anti-idealistic (Hegel). Historically, idealism and immaterialism have always merged. Here we need to strike a negative difference, a foraminiferation, and pursue an immaterialism without idealism. ... What objections does he have to this? Incidentally, “emptier than empty” is not Derridean at all, since Derrida always oscillates between emptiness and fullness or strives towards an absolute negativity, which would be a negative theology. Derrida is still too Jewish. What is needed is a Judaism without Jews and an operation from such a Judaism. Anti-Semitism fights against Judaism without Jews, whereas foraminifederal anti-Semitism fights against the desire to extinguish absence, to finalize it. There can never be enough absence, but must always be “more” (i.e.: less; but here we notice the metaphysics of absence, which we simply have to deal with). The less is the beginning of the inferior value, the subplement (which would no longer be a supplement), the beginning of the world as a deduction of a deduction, a negative difference. And that is no longer Derrida and no longer a deconstruction, but a neconstruction, a negative deconstruction that begins not with the difference, but with the negative difference, the ndifference or foraminifederation.

**Achim Szepanski:** Yes, that’s another accusation Laruelle makes of him. However, he comes to different conclusions than you do.

**Anna Newspeak:** Inferiority is the separation of a deduction, a negative, a less of oneself. This “creates” a negative spectrum that is not itself part of a superordinate (empty) set (the empty

hegemony of Mouffe/Laclau), but a movement of non-sets into non-sets.

**Achim Szepanski:** What is negative difference? Isn't that the same thing that Baecker, Zizek and Arndt do when they subtract the absolute from Hegel? Here, however, it could be argued that such a (split) selfhood of time – including the present – is only possible if a present moment (phenomenon) can be realistically distinguished from another that is not yet or already was, and this always requires a standing now-time. If the present were conceived purely as a series of decaying now-moments (leaps from one to the next without even knowing the moment of connectedness), then we would really have to ask ourselves whether, in order for everything not to be left to decay, there does not have to be a “now” that makes it possible for something else not yet to be or already to have been. There would then not only be the dividedness of the present, but also the standing now of the present, because otherwise we would really only be dealing with the problem of absolute contingency and disintegration. But there is also always the “now” in the sense of simultaneity, which we read as the problem of the temporalization of time...

**Anna Newspeak:** A negative difference is a decay that takes place in itself, a twisting of the world. For example, the difference  $A1/A2$  is conceived from the variable A. The characteristics of variable A are therefore A1 and A2. And these two are always in motion and re-constitution in relation to each other. This is how Derrida thinks with his difference. A negative difference, on the other hand, thinks further, in that the manifestations A1 and A2 themselves become more negative and divide, which is why the manifestations of the variable/difference A1 would be, for example, A11, A12 and A13 as well as A21, A22, A23, A24 and A25, the manifestations of the variable or difference A2. In his conception, Derrida sets the moments of difference absolutely negative and would stop at A1 and A2 and then go back to B with B1, B2, B3, B4, for example. ...

I have unfolded this here on pages 35 to 45 and on 89 to 100: [https://forsproject.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/vortrag\\_foraminiferderalogie\\_disvers\\_13022015.pdf](https://forsproject.files.wordpress.com/2015/03/vortrag_foraminiferderalogie_disvers_13022015.pdf)

...The absolutely absurd thing is that I couldn't/wasn't allowed to give the lecture back then. The negative aspect of foraminiferalogy was “greater” than the positive one. I'm still kind of annoyed about it (to be honest), but on the other hand, there couldn't have been a better justification for the foraminifer deralogy. As I said, the lecture – if I could have given it and been allowed to finish it – would have been ontological in its practice, which is actually contradictory to what I do. But so, absurdly, there has been a nontological practice as that of a non-lecture or non-lecture, an aborted lecture (subtracted from itself) in which the “positive” was less than the “negative”. It's quite blatant.

**Achim Szepanski:** If the two terms A and B are given, which represent concepts, objects etc., then the difference itself (between A and B) is represented by  $A/B$ . The structure of the metadifference now indicates the following: The difference in itself between the two terms (the complex term  $A/B$ ) is distinguished from one of the two terms (A) (which it already includes) and it is identified with the other term (B). For the term B in the relation, the entire expression  $A/B$  is substituted so that the difference ( $A/B$ ) is distinguished from the term A. The result can then be written as follows:  $A/(A/B)$ . Here the term B remains relatively

unanalyzed, or to put it another way, the process remains undecidable and leads to the bad infinity of  $A-B = A/(A/(A/B))$ . We are now faced with the problem of the structure of self-inclusion, i.e. a one-sided doubling of the difference, which is itself one of the terms. The difference thus takes itself as its object and at the same time transcends its own objectification. This can be described not only as meta-difference, but also as meta-relation:  $A-B$ . What happens if one of the terms of the relation is the relation itself? You take the relation  $A-B$  for the term  $B$ , substitute  $B$  with it and again get the expression:  $A-(A-B)$ . But what happens if the fixed term  $A$  is also iterated? Then we not only get  $A=A/B$ , but also  $B=A/B$ . ( $A$  is not equal to  $B$ .) We are obviously in a conflict here insofar as each of the two terms is the difference and the conflict itself. And the figure of the chiasmus represents nothing else. Ultimately, this means that the philosophy of difference cannot tolerate a real non-relationship. On the one hand, there is a tendency in the philosophy of difference (Nietzsche/Deleuze) to maximize the differences, insofar as the first term of difference already promises a higher value that can be driven to infinity; on the other hand, the first term can also remain relatively obscure in order to lead to a primordial ground, which for Heidegger is tautology (the nothingness does not exist). With Nietzsche, it can be claimed that the properties of a thing are only effects on other things. If one now eliminates the term "other thing", then a thing no longer has any properties at all, and the conclusion from this is that there is definitely no thing without other things, i.e. relations absolutely dominate, or in other words, thinghood dissolves completely into the flux of differential events. For Heidegger, instead, the objective particularity of relations must be conceived as dependent on the real, on a non-objective transcendence that separates each relation into two formally distinct sides, one side being assigned to the uncovering and concealment of the being of the existing, and the other side to the object that is indifferent to the other side. With regard to the second aspect, Heidegger poses the question of irreversibility as such, whereby it does not deny itself in the end. At this point, for Heidegger, the Kantian "thing-in-itself" is an essential and tautological subtraction in itself as the essence of being: nothing does not exist. Derrida, on the other hand, performs a complex mixture or chiasmus of the Nietzschean and Heideggerian models – he formulates the meta-difference of the two models. Difference, according to Laruelle's summarizing critique, is a philosophical syntax *sui generis* and a reality or an experience of the real, and thus a principle that is more real than formal, and more transcendental than logical. Difference articulates a mixture as such in the representational mode by demanding the "neither...nor", and at the same time a kind of inclusive disjunction with which the "neither...nor" is so minimally negative that it produces indivisibility as one (nothing as being).

**Anna Newspeak:** Probably the next "stage" is that I will never be able to give my lecture on the justification of the foraminifer deralogy and at some point people will write the book or books or texts based on my Facebook and other discussions that I should actually – ontologically – have written. ...

**Achim Szepanski:** Actually, see above, you are a flawless Nietzschean.

**Anna Newspeak:** Now you're going to laugh: I've never read much Nietzsche... another nontological practice.

**Achim Szepanski:** That's the strange thing, you're suddenly something or someone you've never heard of.

**Anna Newspeak:** "I am not someone else" is the next generation.

**Achim Szepanski:** Okay. Which then opens up a dangerous proximity to Stirner again.

**Anna Newspeak:** Speaking of heard: Althusser's interpellation theorem fails here, because subjectivation takes place without invocation. That's nonject(non)philosophy then, isn't it? ... yes, of course. The "I is not another" must be distinguished from Stirner. It's about being "subjectivized" by nothing or nothings.

**Achim Szepanski:** Nonject(non)philosophy. Okay, I'll have to think about that. Incidentally, the systems theorist Peter Fuchs has some interesting reflections on Derrida with regard to the unject. It's kind of close to your stuff.

**Anna Newspeak:** I don't know Fuchs yet. I might have to have a look at it sometime.

**Achim Szepanski:** [http://www.velbrueck-wissenschaft.de/pdf\\_ausfuehrlich/978-3-934730-30-4.pdf](http://www.velbrueck-wissenschaft.de/pdf_ausfuehrlich/978-3-934730-30-4.pdf)

**Anna Newspeak:** I think the discussion between non-subject and subject revolves around the "sub", which is not negative enough, even if the subject of the subject already points in that direction – supposedly. The meaning of sub is also highly fluctuating in translation; it means both over and under, but often probably also rather under.

**Achim Szepanski:** For Fuchs, objects are always crossed out, i.e. unobjects or transontological objects... Of course, this can also be applied to the subject. I think Fuchs does the same as you. Here is a Fuchs quote: "It is thoroughly dissolved in the further developments of Luhmann's systems theory, which conceives a concept of system that is not spatial in principle: system as the difference between system/environment ( $S = S/U$ ). The system thus becomes the expression of a difference, it is symbolized by the bar of differentiation with which it is observed. It is thus not a place-bound 'being', but, as one could say, a trans-ontological 'object' or, as I sometimes call it: a unject. It is not available for interpenetration and overlapping relationships."

**Anna Newspeak:** "It is not available for interpenetration and overlap relations." That's exactly where I disagree and would rather say that the interpenetration and overlap relationships are negative or nullifying. In other words, they become negative and more negative, emptier and emptier. But the long quote above on Laruelle is of course interesting, but doesn't quite match what I do, but scientifically represents the competition, so to speak, to my thematization in the same field. The good thing about my non-existent Laruelle reading is that it doesn't make me start thinking like Laruelle. This is one of the reasons why I refuse to read the philosopher god Hegel as much as possible. (If I do, then as indirectly as possible and not through male authors.) I'm afraid of adopting this way of thinking, of being occupied by it and then being trapped in disgusting Hegelianism and Hegelian Marxism again.

**Achim Szepanski:** The quote above is mine. From my new book. Fuchs is more precise in the above-mentioned book, where he says that the unject has the property of having no property. It always remains paradoxical or, as you say, negative. But in this case, that also always means connectable. The thinking of the outside is then not included. That's where Dark Deleuze comes in.

**Anna Newspeak:** This reading strategy, this academic strategy, is very much resented institutionally, but I stick to it because the results are better as a result. I don't get caught up in Hegel, but increase the speed of the argument to such an extent that it starts to become negative and I am so "fast" that I slow down without ever stopping: I am slower than slow. That would also be my counter-operationalization to all this speeding up stuff. The best way to explain this is perhaps by going around the earth: Let's assume that an object orbits the earth and is so fast that it overtakes itself, even overtakes itself several times and this self overtaking keeps increasing, then the effect is that the object is slower than itself, n times over.

**Achim Szepanski:** When you say negative, you only think inclusive disjunction, but never exclusive disjunction.

**Anna Newspeak:** I always think negative as n-fold negative, i.e. as a negation of negation. For me, there is no inside, only deconstitutive outsides of deconstitutive outsides.

**Achim Szepanski:** That's not the question. Your fear of reading Hegel is well-founded. Galloway has shown that digital philosophy always begins with Hegel and always with the division of 1 and 2; all further divisions are derived from this. For my sake, n-fold divisions.

**Anna Newspeak:** ... and if the "object" is slower than itself, then it does not circulate, but the "circulation" continues to dissolve, a kind of emptying ring, so to speak. Of course, everything without a ring. (It's an ever-narrowing flow.) ... Somehow, conversations with you are always one of the most "productive" things I do.

**Achim Szepanski:** On disjunction: while for Laruelle, in view of his preference for immanence, the question of the third does not even arise (superposition and idempotence require the following formula:  $1+1=1$ ), Deleuze/Guattari, when read beyond the logical figure of the inclusive disjunction, insist on a quite interesting non-relationship between the first, the second and the third term, insofar as the third, the nomadic term, does not synthesize the other two terms, but rather radically separates itself from them. Here, two terms are conceived within a single object (for example, the liberal and authoritarian components of the state), whereby the third term of the resistant nomadic by no means seeks to synthesize the two terms or to perpetuate the difference, but rather to establish a relationship to the outside. Contradictions must now definitely be conceived outside of duality. The inclusive disjunction (neither... nor/ this or this and/or this and/or this) should therefore be replaced by the radically exclusive disjunction.

**Anna Newspeak:** I have also asked myself whether I should send you the texts I have so "unfinished" for publication on NON. Where all the breaks, incompleteness, splinters, oddities etc. can be seen. For me, that would almost be a nontological practice – and also much more extreme than what Sarah Kofmann does when she puts ellipses in the middle of the text and breaks off. It's all still too clean, too calculated. It has to be much dirtier, much more psychotic.

**Achim Szepanski:** Yes, okay, that's good...

**Anna Newspeak:** When I do that, I get a lot of scolding from the scientific world.

**Achim Szepanski:** Fuck the scientific world.

**Anna Newspeak:** You're right again. .... Thank you for giving me this freedom. No one else

would do that.

...

Forced labor also justifies the dissolution of the current world value relationship (for my sake: of “capital as a total complexion”) and, in addition to UBI, also justifies a BGB, an unconditional land ownership through the creation of a new world currency, which does not – as has always been the case so far – try to translate the existing world value relationship and thus take the power networks with it, but rather rebuilds the world value relationship as a whole, so to speak. This is why the hegemonic world equivalence chain in the existing economic world value relationship (the absolute limit of the existing discourses critical of capitalism) does not have to be taxed for a BGB, but rather a new world economic parallel world is set up. This parallel world is the FORS simulation, which replaces the reality of this world.

...

(Incidentally, one of my weaknesses is that I can't bring myself to transcribe our conversations in mutual interviews that would be publishable on NON. I don't know yet whether I should find this absolutely shitty or whether this is my “superpower”. After all, nontology also changes social practice, which is of course ontological through and through).

**Achim Szepanski:** on the one hand, on the other...

**Anna Newspeak:** We wanted to talk more about derivative communism and unconditional land ownership. What is so-called derivative communism for you?

**Achim Szepanski:** In mathematical terms, derivative communism is described as follows: A complex number has two parts: a real part and an imaginary part, so for example  $2 + 3i$ . If you draw a real line in geometry and place an imaginary line at a right angle, then you can represent the complex number as a point on the graph (with its two axes). Multiplying a number by  $i$  and rotating the line clockwise 90 degrees from the origin is equivalent here. The following can also be written:  $1 * i = i$ ,  $i * i = -1$  Because the square root of  $i$  is  $-1$ ,  $n * i * i = n * -1 = -n$ . This is exactly what formulates the condition of speculative communism. To summarize it briefly and succinctly as an open and cosmological circular form that relies precisely on speculation and waste as negation and is therefore no longer actually a circular form: The real becomes the imaginary, the imaginary becomes the negatively real, the negatively real becomes the negatively imaginary, and the negatively imaginary becomes the real (of derivative communism).

**Anna Newspeak:** I would have some objections to this: the circular form, especially typical in the area of economic questions and discourses, always remains metaphysical without exception, even in its purely negative form. Historically and epistemologically, the more, the increment, the surplus was the formation of capital, which the left has always wanted to bring back into the circle, thus concluding its totalitarianism. It could never imagine anything that was a less, an excrement, a lack that was smaller than any circle and thus smaller than any point (the circle containing itself as a circle). Only with the beginning of a hole that punches or has holes can the inferior value come down, which, after its generalization as a pesipal of all “capital” sorts, also replaces capital without closing the negative into a circle. Zizek is currently doing the same with a negative reading of Hegel and experimenting with negative syntheses,



desontology, etc., all of which remain absence metaphysical (cf. Zizek 2016).

**Achim Szepanski:** Capital does not process in a circle, but in a spiral. If capital has the capacity to set itself in an excessive, growth-oriented and spiral-shaped movement (the circle is a special case of the logarithmic spiral, namely a spiral whose growth is zero) as an end in itself – the starting point here is the end point and vice versa – then it comprehensively dominates the sphere of production as a sui generis monetary process in order to integrate it into the primary “monetary circulation and distribution” G-W-G’.

**Anna Newspeak:** Regardless of whether the “procession of capital” is understood as a circle or a spiral (or both), the more alias G’ alias S’ alias masculine enjoyment (the latter two Lacan) always offers itself as a deviation by pulling apart the circle or the spiral. ... In principle, this can only be countered by turning economic capital as a planetary total complexion into a commodity for all other commodities in money form and then in capital form (differential movement) in order to keep all signifiers/goods/elements/grammas/ghosts/differences/sections/axes/variables/subsets/etc. in a negative-spooky limbo in which no economic or an-economic form ever perfects itself and thus naturalizes itself...

**Achim Szepanski:** But capital as a commodity is precisely what Marx describes as fictitious capital. In the Marxist discussion, there is a debate as to whether, following Hilferding, fictitious capital should be understood as money or as a specific commodity, money as capital. I have reservations about the concept of money as capital, which is a specific commodity. Marx defined the exchange of commodities for money (leaving aside the exchange of the special “commodity” of labor power, which is ultimately not an equivalent exchange despite all of Marx’s explanations) as an exchange of equivalents. However, the exchange of derivatives is precisely not an exchange of equivalents; instead, the aim of the management and exchange of derivatives is clearly to generate profits that are realized in money. When Milios writes that derivatives participate in profit production as duplicates of the capital relation, then it seems appropriate to assume that derivatives are not a commodity (and also not money), but a specific form of capital, namely speculative capital.

**Anna Newspeak:** Of course, but the Marxist spectrum describes economic capital as a commodity for (!) economic (!!!) capital and all its “metamorphoses” or “crazy forms”, i.e. always for itself (= moment of presence metaphysics) – and not for other kinds of capital, i.e. other signifiers in the form of capital (sexual capital, social capital, psychic capital, handkerchief capital, cultural capital, etc.). – In short: all haunting ghosts – which can also all transform themselves into their own fictitious and synthetic forms, just like economic capital, and which must therefore in turn all become commodities for all other types of capital, which they themselves are not, which then ultimately leads nontologically via the inferior value to incessant depreciations, extravagances, derivations and deservations of nifferences and foraminifederations, i.e. to the incessant depreciations, extravagances, derivations and deservations of nifferences and foraminifederations. This is one of the reasons why it was necessary to “justify” the foraminifederalology, since hantology, phantomology of the ghost, grammatology, etc. can no longer grasp the horizon in which we will move from now on, which will be the horizon of neconstruction, which no longer works with rotation and displacement, but with devaluation and nullification). That is the really decisive difference.

**Achim Szepanski:** What you are describing is what Laruelle calls supercapital.

**Anna Newspeak:** No, it's not. You write about supercapital: "If the production/circulation of a physical economic object (classical commodities such as clothing, food, computers, etc.) is directly affected by a credit and this in turn can be massively influenced by the price of its synthetic 'replicant', can we really maintain the previous hierarchical order of classes of exactly three economic objects, with synthetic securities still being spoken of as purely derived securities, derivatives? A table may be a thing for providing a meal, but if factors such as interest rates on loans from the company producing the table, options and insurance on the price of wood and finally currency fluctuations are superimposed on the corresponding factors in production, and this in the context of the production of other goods and services, then a global feast of monetary capital is placed over the extremely modest table (as a physical object)." (Szepanski 2015: section 4) What is thus described as supercapital or hypercapitalism actually almost always refers to economic capital.

**Achim Szepanski:** This is the functioning of economic capital in the 21st century, which determines all the forms of capital you list in the final instance...

**Anna Newspeak:** I don't share this determination in the last instance and consider it to be a reductionist economism that only repeats old mistakes of main contradiction before secondary contradiction and basis before superstructure.

**Achim Szepanski:** In the age of the capitalization of everything and everyone, of genes, organs, wars and love, there is actually no longer any need to discuss the relevance of the concept of determination in the final instance without now seeking the ultimate criterion of truth for theory in empiricism. However, this figure also results quite compellingly from a correct reading of Marx, as I proposed following Althusser. This has absolutely nothing to do with the economism of the 2nd and 3rd Internationals; on the contrary, the theory of non-economics indicates the opposite. We start from the identity of capital and economy, so that there can necessarily be no non-capitalist economy or alternative economy, be it understood as a communal community, as a socialist or communist economy. Non-capitalism equals non-economy, and communism is therefore radically non-economic. Therefore, it is not enough to proclaim an ethically good economy, perhaps conceived as post-capitalism, a socialist market economy or a post-Keynesian welfare state, because it is still based on the idea of a non-capitalist economy. That is one aspect of the non-economy. Non-Marxism has to take this into account. The other aspect of non-Marxism calls for the construction of an eco-fiction as part of a generic science, which can only mean further pushing and radicalizing the Marxist critique of economics. This also includes a critique of his many philosophisms, which materialize in institutions, dispositives and the culture industry.

In his book *Introduction to Non-Marxism*, Laruelle introduces the concept of "supercapitalism", under which he subsumes the following issues: 1) The global functioning of contemporary "societies". 2) In its generality, not only the economy, but also the philosophy-form or form-world, which Laruelle characterizes as an internal duplication of the economy. 3) Its form as specified in a dominant way by the duality of capital and labor, with the economy having priority over the realms of politics, philosophy, etc. The concept of "supercapitalism" serves Laruelle to bring into play the problem of abstract functioning or the abstract machine, a

machine that is in perpetual excess or in search of the permanent surplus that can in principle be extracted from everything possible, and this is where your forms of cultural and symbolic capital come into play, which in any case need to be examined more closely. Capital remains capital in all its methods, forms and differential modes of accumulation, which also process the differential in their actualization-virtualization circuits. And capital must be smashed.

**Anna Newspeak:** I'm afraid that your keyword "smashing capital" ends up in the typical left-wing absence metaphysics that operates under the simple-minded slogan of "abolishing money".

**Achim Szepanski:** Yes, it is absolutely necessary to abolish money, a monstrous act for any normal thinking person. Future-based capitalization is based on the creation of credit, fictitious capital and speculative capital and its risk models, which are taken from probability theory...value-at-risk. The realization or actualization of capital takes place in money, which is also the new beginning of the capital cycle. Purely liquid derivatives, on the other hand, are no longer realized in money. Derivative communism demands the improbable against the probable, namely indefinite and virtual derivatives in the game of free liquidity (without the realization of the derivative in money). The non-economy takes particular account of the fact that production always takes place under uncertainty, although this does not mean that improvements take place through knowledge, information and modeling, although these are not subject to capitalist efficiency criteria.

In the communist quarter turn, the improbable in the sense of Blanchot is always to be thought of. From the point of view of the process, it approaches the Laruellian quarter-turn, the real:  $-1=-n$ . From the point of view of the real in the sense of continuance, it is  $1=n$ . Of course, this completely contradicts the logic of capital, which injects the surplus into the tautology:  $G-G'$ . The real in Laruelle's work is not equal to reality or the logic of capital. The real is the result of a transcendental positing, it is given-without-given and at the same time defined as a negative possibility that stands for any "tangibility" of objects and for the rigor of thought itself. In short, it is about the One that is not (negative possibility), but is nevertheless real (given-without-given). The différence turned negative, on the other hand, is the deterritorialized derivative movement under the conditions of capital. No wonder that Malik also describes it as such, but without finding a link to the concept of capital.

**Anna Newspeak:** Wrong. I go even further than Malik and Derrida, who both generalize capital as an archederivative or spectral ghost. But at the moment in which economic capital/ money becomes a commodity for all other "signifiers" (which will then "be" empty voids), which in turn slip into all socio-economic and -aneconomic forms in order to henceforth haunt together and all together as negative ghosts or to securitize themselves as derivatives (negative derivatives) in a negative-destinctive tyranny of fate and determination with negative-quasi-infinite divisibility (here a nontological "logic" of the post takes effect), the logic of capital is overthrown, since a.) economic capital is no longer the ultimate or predominant purpose of the movement of the world and also all other kinds of capital can no longer connote an ultimate or predominant purpose for themselves, b.) economic capital, just like all other kinds of capital, now only waft as negative relations/differences of negative relations/ differences (nontological in-reference-settings of others among others without A/others, even

if this A/other is absolutely negative such as e.g. -1, empty signification). e.g. -1, empty signifier/hegemony in Mouffe/Laclau, JHWE, ground, ground, root, foundation, nadir, 0, foot, base, base value, underlying, sinthome, mother, etc.), c.) from the generalized inferior value to the generalized derivative (neither of which are symmetrical reflections of surplus value to derivative and neither of which represent or instate a generalization of debt and indebtedness) only non-derivative derivations of non-derivative derivations take place and d.) since economic capital (and further every type of capital) has become a commodity, the global socialization of all money and all monetary functions is thus implemented, which is dematerialized in BGB, BGE, money, credit and derivative creation and destruction possibilities within a global black market (im)balance between all negative differences. Black market also because the new digital world currency of the FORS behaves like a discarded or negative market vis-à-vis the white market of the more than 80 global currencies of economic capital, whose collapse, contradictions and self-presence or self-absence it simultaneously intercepts (backup function), hostilely takes over (social struggle) and subtends (nontologization of the re-productive forces and the re-productive relations, i.e. the world).

**Achim Szepanski:** Let us first come to capital: capital is an axiom/law that defines that the meaning of the relation  $G-W-G'$  contains a more that is lacking per se. The presupposed signifier (money), to put it in the words of linguistics, but without proposing a linguistic theory of capital here, points to an invisible signified (more), which is indicated in further surplus signifiers (money). The signified of the surplus, which is contained in the signifying chain of (advanced and realized) money and yet remains invisible, is indicated in ever further signifiers that represent the signified of the surplus, i.e. we are dealing with a non-equivalent sliding figure that can be written as follows:

$G \ G'$

$G' \ G''$

etc. etc., whereby one should think of an arrow from  $G'$  bottom left to  $G'$  top right – at the top the chain of money signifiers, at the bottom the driving forces of the money signifiers... The term “money surplus value” here sui generis conditions the (bourgeois) concept of surplus value, insofar as the latter has completely emancipated itself from its content, and this fact implies, as a purely formal sliding process, the systemic “lack”, the “lack” of surplus or the famous immoderation of capital, whereby the anticipation of more, oriented towards the future, dominates the lack and not vice versa, so that a definition of lack based on Lacan or a representation of the economy oriented towards the explication of scarcity, whether it is conceived contingently or non-contingently, is excluded from the outset. The boundlessness (as an anticipation of the more) of capital or, more precisely, the more now dominates the lack and not the lack the more.

That would be capital as method or logic, from the point of view of lack and more. But in the final instance, it is not individual capital but total capital that is the starting point, so that the three volumes of Capital are actually to be read from the back. Total capital is conceived as a quasi-transcendental constitution, namely as the a priori effect of total capital on individual capitals, whereby total capital is to be understood only secondarily as the result of effects (the strategies of individual capitals) or as a determination by the determined (this distinguishes

the quasi-transcendental constitution of capital from the determination-in-the-last-instance by the real). Due to the consideration of the second moment (the strategies of the individual capitals), we only speak of the quasi-transcendental nature of capital. Quasi-transcendentality is of course not understood as Kantian subjective transcendental, but rather as objective determination-in-the-last-instance, and this implies determined relations (given-without-given), which as givens, however, are already effected, i.e. are the effect of objectified (economic) "structures" (total capital functions here as a negative possibility or as transcendental). Total capital is not a "thing" that could be transferred and moved; rather, as the dominant mode of production of every historically specific capitalist social formation, it is characterized by determination and virtuality, which is actualized through the competition or strategies of the individual capitals. Competition produces the formation of a general average profit rate in the economically standardized space of a national domestic market in turbulent patterns and repetitions, which, however, always revolve around a center of gravity. The production of average profit rates is an emergent process, the unintended result of a constant search for higher profits. The actualization-virtualization circuits of capital, which take place through the competition of individual capitals, form the temporalizing aspect of capital. Différance has its place in the actualization-virtualization circuits of capital.

**Anna Newspeak:** I have also come across the issue of the concatenation of signifiers and the proximity of S' and G'. I would criticize this both in Lacan (who speaks of male enjoyment) and in Derrida (who speaks of the supplement), since the more is fundamentally, i.e. also "ontologically" wrong, although of course all ontology is characterized by the more (expansion of the universe, dissemination, becoming, etc.). The mistake of the post-structuralist generation was to think of the S, i.e. the signifier, as materiality rather than immateriality in the sense of negative, non-materiality (and no, this is not about idealism). We could also say more comprehensibly: we are dealing with negative, empty matter. In other words, it is not being/becoming/positive matter that moves, but nothingness/nothingness/negative matter that moves. Because the latter is the case, we are not dealing with an enlargement/increase of the world, but with a diminution/reduction that contains the enlargement/increase *as a part*, but not a majority. So not S' or G', but 'S or 'G. This destroys not only the surplus value (profit, return, etc.), but even the Derridean legacy, because the supplement (it is supplementation) also belongs in the series of G' and S'. This is why a negative deconstruction, i.e. neconstruction, comes into play, which, for example, must understand the movement of the world as "textual" sub-complementation (de-supplementation). Furthermore, the commodification of economic capital for all other elements/empties/variables/signifiers/differences/oppositions/contradictions/sections, etc. in the form of capital precisely causes the fall of the *immoderation* of economic capital, whereby the other types of capital in turn sink to the level of commodities for the others, so that the social world relationship is incessantly resignified and re-evaluated. An "abolition of money" as the abolition of every form of money of every kind of capital, on the other hand, sets up non-capital (the empty signifier, absolute absence, empty quantity, quantity of all quantities, 0, -1 etc.) as the new super-capital, i.e. as super-non-capital, and subjects all social complexes to the immoderation of a new n/ontological form of money, which, as the ultimate purpose, only determines a further variant of a metaphysics of the absence of presence and absence. This can also be understood as a negative theology.

**Achim Szepanski:**

Theologically, as is not difficult to prove, is the concept of *différance*. I think that if you get involved in deconstruction, you never escape it. You are trapped. The *différance* is latched onto the meta-level as difference, or, to put it another way, the *différance* establishes the identity of difference as a meta-level. But if, qua such an identity, there were only the postponement of supplements, then consequently there should no longer be any supplements, because each supplement would be its own origin. And if the whole of the text disappears under the predominance of *différance*, then this would also have to apply to *différance* itself. Therefore, *différance* must be stabilized by setting itself (albeit unspoken) as absolute. Deconstruction thus remains an absolute process of the relative and cannot be held absolute without the reserve; it exists in the relation relative-absolute. Only this allows Derrida to determine that the continuum always contains a relation of connecting and cutting; the continuum is this relation and it relates *sui generis* to further continua in the same way. All negative movements, such as those of displacement and postponement, are to be understood as instruments of a general A-economy, which may even have something in common with the figure of thought of inclusive disjunction as conceived by Deleuze/Guattari in *Anti-Oedipus*. This and/or that – that is the mode of inclusive disjunction. *Différance* would thus have the same positive identity as Deleuzian difference, it would bring things together in a disjunctive mode at the same time.

Free Liquidity no longer recognizes precisely this relationship or, as far as I am concerned, this sliding process, and it would have to be investigated whether Derrida's *différance* is not precisely this sliding process. On the other hand, the communist A-logic of the derivative must be carried out. The dispute as to what the derivative is now relaxes along the opposition of money (Hilferding & Co) and commodity (commodity as capital), the latter best explained by Milios. I think we are dealing with a new form of capital, that of speculative capital, from which realization is withdrawn in speculative communism, whereby it ceases to exist as capital, then the game with negative relations does indeed begin, but it is not a wobble, but remains related to the real. There is then no more capital, nor non-capital, but the much more exciting game of derivatives, which relies on free optionality. The idea of money as a commodity with substance or value is a relic of the Marxist theory of labour value, which cannot be got rid of even if money is functionalized, as Simmel did and Derrida takes to the extreme. Putting a minus instead of a plus in money capital does not change the logic of capital at all.

**Anna Newspeak:** The naturalized construction of the difference between gainful employment and care work (work and activity, production and reproduction, etc.) under the absolute rule of the former should be rejected in its entirety for nontological mourning work. Instead, it is necessary to pay for everything without exception, i.e. to attribute it to the denaturalized world value relation, under the all-encompassing precondition of the commodification of money (of economic capital and further of every kind of capital) for all other signifiers/goods that slip into money form in order to move as (negative) capital from then on. The combination of historicity and valuation, which must be the decisive issue here in order not to end up in valuation-less historicities (use value, need, self-sufficiency, subsistence, primitive communism, simple exchange of goods, abolition of money as a differential movement and

valuation, but also the lack of valuation underlying the monetary from the outset through self-setting final mediation as a standard without mediation as a setting in relation to other commodities/signifiers in the form of money), ensures the structural liberation that goes hand in hand with the disempowerment of the hegemonic world equivalence chain (all capitals, so to speak, in Mouffe-Laclauian diction all “hegemonies”; in Derridean diction, all “presences”), the unconditional land ownership of economic capital (and all other types of capital, although we hardly know anything about their BGB form), the unconditional basic income of economic capital (and all other types of capital, although we hardly know anything about their UBI form either), an economic derivative communism (as a complete re-division and re-volumization of all previous derivative volumes among all negative differences of the world for the purpose of de-teleologizing and denaturalizing the sold future or time; whereby, of course, derivative communisms for all other types of capital are also to be gradually realized and the archederivative proclaimed by Suhail Malik precedes all of this), under all negative differences in the disverse of socialized negative-differential money, credit and derivatives. dendite and derivative or nerivate creation and destruction “rights” or possibilities, a negative-differential world market imbalance/equilibrium between the sphere of production and the sphere of reproduction or between real “money capital” (de-realized-actualized or arte-facto-actu-virtualitarian capital; all assets, incomes and prices – and this again for all “types of capital”, although we know even less here), fictitious capital (in actualizing-virtualizing or arte-facto-actu-virtualitarian de-realization; all fictitious assets, incomes and prices – and this again for all types of “capital”, although we know even less here) and synthetic “capital” (in virtualizing-actualizing or arte-facto-actu-virtualitarian de-realization; all synthetic assets, incomes and prices – and this again for all types of “capital”, although we know less than nothing here). However, since we have to start with the negative derivative – the nerivative – in order to understand the “nerivative comminism” (the mistake is intentional: the coming of the minus or subtraction) as pesipalism (negative “capitalism” of the undervaluation of the minor as inferior value, contrafit, nins, subminus, dedite, abitrage, desesignorage, etc.) of the foraminiferalogy. In order to set up the foraminiferalogy in the FORS simulation, a disversal parallel world, we also start with the foraminifederation as a derivation of a derivation (a negative difference in itself), in which the ark derivative is formed as a new concatenation and re-securitization of space and time equivalent to around 1 quadrillion euros in conclusio. ... None of this has anything to do with hyper-capitalism and the super-capital of economic capital as an expanding world formation of total capital exploitation of human and non-human life forms.

**Achim Szepanski:** Nerivate-communism does indeed seem to me to be the better term... Well, let's start by making a big demand, direct and unconditional access to all money and all forms of capital that henceforth process differentially-negatively, or let's say it with Stiegler, process negentropically as a pharmakon, but only to replace them at the same moment with moneyless nerivatives. But let's start with the small fish: The accelerationists and leftists of all stripes are today frugal social democrats who are content to make petty demands, putting themselves in the position of the measuring and presumptuous creditor, all with moderation and decency. On the other hand, the creditor-debtor relationship needs to be broken out of completely by propagating the debt strike on the one hand and liquidating the claim on the other, either by exaggerating it to infinity, which I see as one of the aims of your project, or by remaining silent, i.e. not making any demands. The revenge of the insurgents lies precisely in

this silence. Once the credit cycle has been suspended, derivatives or nerivatives come into play, whose optionalities refer to nothing more than artefacts that are played out negatively without being synthesized, as Marx suggested in his somewhat naïve remarks on communism.

There are generally two mutually exclusive lines: Affirmation-ignorance-value-financial supercapital versus negation-intolerance-minus-value-speculative communism. Speculative communism requires the destruction of this world, that is, on the one hand, the destruction of the system of wage labor or employment and the system of precarious work. of employment and the system of precarious, digitalized work, digitalized leisure and knowledge, so that the individual brain and the collective body can be de-automated again on the basis of automation, i.e. be supplied with negentropic knowledge and work that is based on interruption and free time and produces negentropic knowledge (this is why we consider the question of a reduction in working hours and an unconditional basic income to be of secondary importance under capitalist conditions; free time then only serves the further consumption of disposable gadgets). On the other hand, the politics of negation requires the unconditional destruction of all forms of capital, including fictitious and synthetic capital, in concrete terms the global and unconditional expropriation of all millionaire and billionaire companies. This capital will be converted into derivatives, or rather nerivatives, which will no longer be realized in money, and thus both money and capital will immediately lose their relevance. The indefinite, negative game (Fourier) begins with the nerivatives, which are related to future nerivatives, without a synthesization qua speculative capital taking place; rather, a communist transindividuation is achieved with the nerivatives, which is based on free optionality. Free optionality contradicts the modeling of choice as propagated by financial mathematics or nudging, it also contradicts a mere increase in the number of choices, nor does it simply perfect the Deleuzian game of differences by deploying a deterritorializing war machine of exotic derivatives with the aim of nomadic distribution, as elaborated by Benjamin Lozano, rather it is directed towards the luxury surplus that transcends the market, with processes of de-automation taking place on the basis of automation, times of interruption that lead to new acts of knowledge production in which one expands oneself and others through transindividuation. This is the liberation of the real itself, insofar as it is via nerivatives that open up futures, precisely because it is assumed that the future will remain black, psychic and colloquial objectives will be organized, think of libidinal desire, noetic work, free time, resource consumption, technologies, etc. This goes via planning and cybernetics. This goes beyond planning and cybernetic simulation models that depict the time dependency and the relations between the variables of the system to be simulated, because the real and prognostic power of speculative communism is far greater. However, this still needs to be explained in detail.

At present, the real is conceived purely as a mode of access to possibilities that must be actualized as money, an organological and technological mode of access in which the potential for transformation is a question of the endless actualization of possibilities, and this within the framework of probability theory and not speculation.

Communist speculation releases liquidity, which now functions as optionality on the accumulated wealth in communism, whereby speculative justice consists not only in the



optionality on the historically already accumulated knowledge and the historically already accumulated wealth, but also in the optionality on the coming wealth and on the coming knowledge (futuristic negentropy). This optionality is produced via processes of psychic, collective and technical individuation and, as a transindividuation of improbabilities and interruptions, is negentropic sui generis.

**Anna Newspeak:** Yes, I am also concerned with free liquidity and speculation... If there had ever been such a thing as left-wing Randism (analogous to left-wing Schmittianism with regard to Carl Schmitt), then it would be more understandable if I said that free liquidity creates a truly “free market”, but one that eliminates all the totalitarian and metaphysical elements of Ayn Rand and co. “Free market” is also close to Freud’s ‘free association’ and ‘equal attention’ and Marx’s ‘free association’. However, the entire metaphysics must not be continued or repeated.

**Achim Szepanski:** On the other hand, speculative communism could also be described, with Stiegler, as processes of psychic and collective de-automatization in processes of transindividuation. What is important here is to escape market socialism on the one hand and the planned economy on the other. The most developed instruments of capital, the derivatives, are quantized and at the same time de-automated in processes of negentropic transindividuation. The question is precisely how to escape naturalization (measurement of labour quanta, Cockshott) on the one hand and the rewriting of forms of money and capital on the other (see Jiří Kosta’s market socialism and cryptocurrencies such as bitcoins, etc.). Both are past-related automation processes that fall behind the present state of capital, which is sui generis related to the future, but always closes it off, i.e. makes it probable, while speculative communism on the basis of automation and the de-automation of knowledge and derivatives begins the game with the improbable (Blanchot). ... For me, however, the derivatives are anti-capital, aneconomic, but by no means naturalized, but highly artificial negentropic forms of wealth. Liberated derivatives are never realized in money, and are therefore no longer speculative capital, but free liquidity, or, which is the same thing, illiquidity.

**Anna Newspeak:** Yes... put “capital” in quotation marks... In fact, it is no longer capital, because the unitarization of money as an overall social (ultimate) purpose has been eliminated. But: it is still “capital” insofar as it moves differentially, or more precisely: negatively differentially. But it no longer moves purely or predominantly positively as any form of surplus (surplus value, profit, return, interest, seignorage, etc.), but negatively without absolute absence. That is why I am trying to coin the negative gramma of the pesipal...

**Achim Szepanski:** Differentiation yes, not in the sense of Lacan’s lack, which is also a characteristic of capital.

**Anna Newspeak:**... Yes, not in the sense of the abscentist lack that makes us all starve / wants to make us starve. On the other hand, I would rather say that capital suppresses and fights lack/the less in order to realize itself as a more-form, i.e. to be able to expand. Capital is very “anti-lack” here...

**Achim Szepanski:** Yes, surplus determines scarcity, not the other way around. There is always a lack of surplus.

**Anna Newspeak:** If you didn't conceive and understand the real with Laruelle and Deleuze in such a terribly metaphysical way, I would say exactly the same thing. But for me it would be a "double" or differential real: once as a complete new symbolic order (the symbolic order falls into the real, which psychoanalytically corresponds to privation), but which at the same time falls back into the ever-next real (privation of privation), without ever being able to constitute itself again as a symbolic order. You only think simple privation, which is also a psychosis. (This is why you can say nothing or almost nothing more about "post-capitalist" economic events, but end up in a lack of imagination in which all differences have collapsed into one in the real). The psychosis of presence metaphysics or absence metaphysics (one-in-one) that is to be combated can only be escaped through a psychosis of this psychosis that is to be driven forward, in which the difference is re-established, and now as a negative difference, since the differences have all become real and no longer belong to the symbolic, which therefore no longer exists either. Hence the privatization of privatization... Incidentally, FORS or unconditional land ownership also aims to destroy the current derivative concatenations of economic capital (as well as the derivative concatenations of every kind of capital), since in these past, present and future are already sold, and not somehow, but almost completely along the hegemonic world equivalence chain.

**Achim Szepanski:** On the real, see above, it has a physical and a metaphysical component. But it is quite simple: by preventing the realization of the derivative through the derivative, both money and capital fail at the same time – a fairly simple thought. It is quite wrong, as Žižek does, to identify the real with capital, which he then describes as ghostly, in order to save the real as the pores that capital cannot occupy or close. It would not occur to Laruelle to think of the reality of capital as even close to the real. His terms are therefore better understood as references to communism than as analytical terms for the representation and critique of capital. One could summarize the real in Laruelle's work as follows: First, a universalization of the concept of base or infrastructure; second, the postulate of a base that remains closed to any superstructure; third, the postulate of a determination in the last instance, and as a kind of non-ontological causality; fourth, the unification of science and philosophy as objects or related to the unilateral causality that derives from the real. The concept of determination in the last instance must therefore be withdrawn from the social-historical terrain and include a kind of formal axiom that opens up to the negentropy of speculative communism.

**Anna Newspeak:**... which perfects the metaphysics of absence. But it is important to be able to think a new concatenation and new securitization of the derivative or derivative. Otherwise the much-cited lights will go out... but that alone is only darkness/blackness. But it has to get even darker/blacker. In other words, it is one thing to interrupt the "credit cycles" and let them fail, but it is another to intercept this major collapse and turn it around negatively.

**Achim Szepanski:** That's exactly the point. If all cycles of all types of capital are automated today, what then? The demand for less work will then come to nothing because it will immediately be taken over by leisure capital. What counts is de-automation on the basis of automation, the negentropic interruption that is the precondition for creating labour as a noetic activity and the optionality of speculative derivatives that conditions it.

**Anna Newspeak:** I'm not generally against de-automation... Can you elaborate on this aspect

of the de-automation of concatenation-automatism? What does that look like in concrete terms?

**Achim Szepanski:** An a-economical epoch is something that breaks with an already constituted automatism that has long been socialized by capital and has the capacity to produce its own de-automation through the appropriation of knowledge: The suspension of the social automation of capital takes place precisely when new asocial forms of automation appear. New forms of de-automation in the sense of negentropy are released in order to invent new social organizations of the non-economy. Knowledge is always related to these processes, while stupidity benefits purely from automation.

[<](#) [PREVIOUS](#) [NEXT](#) [→](#)

---

## META

- CONTACT
- FORCE-INC/MILLE PLATEAUX
- IMPRESSUM
- DATENSCHUTZERKLÄRUNG

## TAXONOMY

- CATEGORIES
- TAGS
- AUTHORS
- ALL INPUT

## SOCIAL

- FACEBOOK
- INSTAGRAM
- TWITTER